

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 9, 2003 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-64 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31, 43, 44, 46, 47, 52, 53, 58, 60, 61, and 63 have been amended, claims 12 and 42 have been canceled and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-11, 13-41, and 43-64 are pending in the application and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the specification to update the cross-reference to its related application. No new matter has been added.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the Office Action, claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,461,708 to Kahn (hereafter "Kahn"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, insofar as it may be applied to the amended claims, for at least the following reasons.

First, with respect to each of the independent claims, Kahn does not disclose the recited steps (or equivalent) of "receiving a user input indicative of one of the totals" and "generating a graph using a predefined rule corresponding to the one of the totals indicated by the user input". The corresponding portion in Kahn cited in the Office Action, col. 9, lines 8-27 teaches a step of receiving a user input that indicates data blocks or series desired to be included in the graph. This indicates that the user has to select all blocks which are desired to be plotted as the graph.

In sharp contrast, as recited in the pending independent claims, the user simply selects one of the totals, not the blocks of data as suggested by Kahn. That is, per the claimed invention, the data items used to generate a graph are determined by the system, not by the user. This recited feature is not disclosed or suggested by Kahn. Accordingly, Kahn does not teach either the recited features or the specific advantages afforded by the claimed invention.

Second, independent claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 have been amended to incorporate the hierarchical format (originally recited in canceled claims 12 and 42 of the reports used for automatically generating the graphs). That is, the claimed invention recites that clicking (for example) on totals are used not just to generate graphs based on underlying data determined by the system (and not the user as taught by Kahn) but that the claimed invention accounts for the hierarchical format of the underlying data with groups at a first level being nested within groups at a second level. All report formats (and corresponding graph generation) disclosed in Kahn are not hierarchical. Accordingly, these recited features provide an additional reason for the patentability of these independent claims.

Third, with respect to the independent claims 22, 23, 52 and 53, the Office Action asserts in paragraphs 23 and 24, that the recited features are disclosed in column 12, lines 35-45 of Kahn. However, this assertion is incorrect. Nowhere does Kahn teach displaying the linked corresponding different value when a user clicks a feature in the graph. Therefore, these recited features provide an additional reason for the patentability of these claims.

Fourth, with respect to 63 and 64, the Office Action asserts in paragraphs 32 and 33, that Kahn discloses the recited features in column 12, lines 41-47 and column 13, lines 8-19. However, the cited portion does not teach or suggest extracting corresponding data for the one of the totals from a series of reports. The Office Action appears to confuse a data series with the claimed report series where the report series may represent a time series of a particular report as claimed in claim 64. Nowhere does Kahn disclose or suggest extracting, from a series of reports, data corresponding to one of the totals (in each of the reports of the series) and graphing the extracted data. Accordingly, these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by Kahn and these recited features provide an additional reason for the patentability of these claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment

would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 8, 2003

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.